

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are currently pending in the present application, all of which have been amended.

Support for the amendments in Claims 1 and 8 can be found on page 9, line 9 - page 10, line 16 of the specification and Figure 4.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for not particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection insofar as it might apply to the claims as amended herein.

The phrase "assigning a weight" has been deleted from Claims 1 and 8. Thus, the § 112 rejection is believed to be overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-6 and 8-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Miller* (US 6,742,141) in view of *Kramer et al.* (US 7,096,210). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection insofar as it might apply to the claims as amended herein.

Amended Claim 1 (and similarly Claim 8) now recites a step of "determining whether or not a connection failure occurred at said network connection" and a step of "invoking an inference engine to utilize said real-time connectivity information in said local persistent knowledgebase to re-establish a network connection to said computer network." The claimed determining and invoking steps are not taught or suggested by either *Miller* or *Kramer*.

Because the claimed invention recites novel features that are not found in the cited references, whether considered separately or in combination, the § 103 rejection is believed to be overcome.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-14 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-2, 4-5 and 8 of co-pending application number 10/733,055 and *Miller* (US 9,742,141). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection insofar as it may apply to the claims as amended herein.

Applicants believe the non-statutory double patenting rejection has been overcome by the additional features added to Claims 1-14. Thus, the non-statutory double patenting rejection is believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-14 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claims 1 and 8 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any additional fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of the present application, please charge it against Lenovo Corporation Deposit Account No. **50-3533**.

Respectfully submitted,



Antony P. Ng
Registration No. 43,427
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy., suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS